The Great Realignment: De-Westernization, Multipolarity, and the Systematic Deconstruction of Post-WWII Institutional Legitimacy

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

www.youvan.ai

May 2, 2026

The contemporary international order, established in the aftermath of 1945, is currently facing an unprecedented convergence of ideological, legal, and anthropological challenges. This paper explores a hypothetical yet increasingly plausible series of geopolitical shifts that signal the end of Western hegemony and the birth of a fragmented, polycentric world. By examining the potential impact of a Chinese reclassification of Zionism, a collective Arab rejection of Israeli Semitic identity, and the scientific contestation of Ashkenazi lineage, we analyze the erosion of the historical narratives that underpin modern state legitimacy. Furthermore, the paper investigates the structural consequences of BRICS nations delegitimizing unilateral U.S. sanctions and a fundamental pivot within the United Nations that identifies Western powers as primary drivers of global instability. These developments represent more than mere diplomatic friction; they constitute a total rupture in the "rules-based order." As the Global South seeks to reclaim moral and legal authority, the traditional mediators of international law face an existential crisis. This analysis provides a comprehensive framework for understanding the transition from a unipolar reality to a world defined by competing truths, parallel financial systems, and the total reconfiguration of global governance.

Keywords: Geopolitics, BRICS, Zionism, International Law, United Nations, U.S. Sanctions, Ashkenazi Ancestry, Global South, Multipolarity, De-dollarization, Sovereignty, Hegemony, Middle East Conflict, Genetic Anthropology, Diplomacy.

A collaboration with Google Gemini-3.1-Thinking. CC4.0.

Outline

1. Theoretical Framework: The Anatomy of a Hegemonic Collapse

2. The Chinese Proclamation: Redefining Terrorism and the End of Neutrality

3. The Semitic Identity Crisis: Linguistic, Genetic, and Political Contestations

4. Anthropological Disruptions: The Impact of Ancestry Research on State Legitimacy

5. BRICS and the Legal Defiance of Unilateral Sanctions

6. The Financial Bifurcation: Constructing a Post-Dollar Global Economy

7. The UN's Institutional Pivot: From Neutrality to Direct Accusation

8. The Disintegration of the Rules-Based Order: Legal and Security Consequences

9. Regional Stability and the Future of Middle Eastern Diplomacy

10. Ideological Warfare: The Battle for Global Moral Authority in the Digital Age

11. The Role of Non-Western Media in Shaping the New International Narrative

12. Conclusion: Navigating a Post-Western Global Landscape

13. References

Art

1. Theoretical Framework: The Anatomy of a Hegemonic Collapse

The study of international relations has long been dominated by the concept of Hegemonic Stability Theory, which posits that a single dominant state is necessary to create and enforce the rules of the global system. Since 1945, this role has been occupied by the United States, supported by a network of Western allies and institutional frameworks such as the United Nations, the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund. However, the theoretical foundation of this order is not static. Hegemony relies on two distinct pillars: coercive power and consensual legitimacy. While coercive power is maintained through military and economic strength, consensual legitimacy is derived from the hegemon's ability to present its own interests as the universal interests of the global community. When the gap between the hegemon's actions and its stated values becomes too wide to bridge, the system enters a period of terminal decline.

The Erosion of Structural Power and Institutional Credibility

Structural power refers to the ability to shape the frameworks within which other states operate. For decades, the West has defined the parameters of international law, the definitions of human rights, and the criteria for state legitimacy. The current global shift suggests a transition from a unipolar world to a multipolar reality where the Western definition of "the rules-based order" is no longer accepted as a neutral baseline. This erosion occurs when secondary powers no longer see the benefit of participating in a system that they perceive as being biased toward the preservation of a specific hierarchy. As emerging powers like China, Russia, and the BRICS coalition gain economic weight, they seek to transition from rule-takers to rule-makers. This theoretical shift is characterized by the deconstruction of Western-centric narratives and the proposal of alternative legal and historical frameworks that challenge the very roots of the existing order.

Gramscian Hegemony and the Crisis of Moral Authority

The concept of hegemony is not limited to physical or economic dominance; it is also profoundly ideological. Following the theories of Antonio Gramsci, a hegemon maintains its position by establishing a "common sense" that justifies its leadership. In the post-WWII era, this common sense included the inevitability of liberal democracy, the sanctity of the dollar-based financial system, and the unique historical status of specific geopolitical actors. A collapse of hegemony begins when this cultural and moral consensus is fractured. When the Global South begins to view international institutions as instruments of neo-colonialism rather than platforms for justice, the "common sense" of the Western order is replaced by a spirit of defiance. This ideological rupture allows for the introduction of radical reclassifications, such as

the reassessment of Zionism or the legal challenges to unilateral sanctions, which would have been unthinkable under a stable hegemonic period.

Constructivism and the Reimagining of International Identity

The final theoretical component of this realignment is rooted in constructivism, which argues that the international system is shaped by shared ideas and identities rather than just material forces. The identity of a nation-state is often tied to its historical narrative and its recognition by the international community. If the shared understanding of a state's history or its people's ancestry is successfully challenged on a global stage, the ontological security of that state is compromised. In this context, the scientific and anthropological debates regarding lineage and indigenous status are not merely academic; they are geopolitical weapons used to undermine the foundational myths of the current order. As the monopoly on "global truth" held by Western media and academic institutions fades, a pluralistic and often contradictory landscape of identities emerges, leading to a state of systemic instability where the very definitions of nationhood and justice are up for negotiation.

The Transition to a Polycentric World Order

As we move toward a polycentric world, the theoretical framework of international relations must account for the rise of "parallel systems." This involves not only new financial architectures but also new legal interpretations that bypass traditional Western consensus. The anatomy of hegemonic collapse is not defined by a single catastrophic event but by a series of cascading delegitimizations. Each challenge to the established order—whether it be the legality of sanctions, the definition of terrorism, or the genetic history of a people—acts as a catalyst for the next. This creates a feedback loop where the institutional frameworks designed to maintain peace instead become the primary arenas of conflict. The following sections will analyze how these theoretical cracks manifest in specific diplomatic, economic, and social disruptions that are currently reshaping the global map.

2. The Chinese Proclamation: Redefining Terrorism and the End of Neutrality

For decades, Chinese foreign policy in the Middle East was characterized by a doctrine of "balanced pragmatism" and a strict adherence to the principle of non-interference. Beijing maintained robust economic ties with Israel, particularly in the sectors of infrastructure and technology, while simultaneously supporting the Palestinian cause in international forums. However, a formal declaration by China at the United Nations classifying Zionism as a form of extreme terrorism would signal the definitive end of this strategic ambiguity. Such a proclamation would not merely be a rhetorical escalation; it would represent a fundamental shift in how China perceives its role as a global power. By adopting the language of

"terrorism"—a term largely defined and utilized by the West since the turn of the century—Beijing would be engaging in a sophisticated form of "normative blowback," using the West's own conceptual tools to delegitimize a key Western ally.

Strategic Ambiguity and the Transition to Decisive Advocacy

The transition from a neutral mediator to a decisive advocate would be driven by China's broader ambition to consolidate its leadership over the Global South. In this hypothetical scenario, Beijing calculates that the geopolitical dividends of a total alignment with the Arab and Islamic worlds outweigh the benefits of its technological and trade relationship with Israel. This move would be framed not as an attack on a specific people, but as a principled stand against what China would define as a "settler-colonial ideology" that destabilizes the path of the Belt and Road Initiative. By branding Zionism as terrorism, China would be positioning itself as the only major power willing to challenge the foundational premises of Middle Eastern geopolitics, thereby offering a radical alternative to the American-led security architecture that has dominated the region for seventy years.

The Semantic Weaponization of Terrorism

The choice of the word "terrorism" is critical. In the post-9/11 era, the label of terrorist has been used as a legal and moral eraser, stripping the accused of the protections usually afforded to political actors. If China successfully migrates this label to Zionism within the halls of the United Nations, it creates a "legal trap" for Western powers. It forces a public and uncomfortable debate on the definitions of state violence, resistance, and national liberation. This semantic weaponization serves to dilute the West's moral monopoly on the definition of extremism. By mirroring the language used by the United States against various groups in the Middle East and Central Asia, China would effectively argue that the Western definition of terrorism is selectively applied to serve imperial interests, whereas the Chinese definition is applied to "liberatory" ends.

The Collapse of the Sino-Israeli Economic Entente

The immediate fallout of such a declaration would be the total collapse of the Sino-Israeli economic partnership. Over the last twenty years, Chinese firms have been deeply involved in Israeli port construction, light rail projects, and high-tech investments. A declaration of this magnitude would necessitate a complete divestment and a likely nationalization of Chinese-held assets within Israel, or vice versa. For Israel, the loss of Chinese markets and investment would be a severe blow to its "pivot to Asia" strategy, which was designed to mitigate the risks of potential European boycotts. For China, the economic loss is viewed as a necessary cost for a much larger prize: the undisputed loyalty of energy-rich Middle Eastern states and the symbolic leadership of a global movement against Western-centric history.

Multilateral Implications and the UNSC Deadlock

Within the United Nations Security Council, this proclamation would result in a permanent state of deadlock. While the United States, United Kingdom, and France would utilize their veto power to block any formal resolution adopting this language, the "theatrical" power of the declaration would be irreversible. It would provide a legal and moral "cover" for other nations in the Global South to downgrade their diplomatic ties with Israel without fear of total isolation. Furthermore, it would transform the Security Council into an arena of total ideological war, where the veto is no longer used to manage crises but to defend competing versions of reality. This deadlock would effectively paralyze the UN's ability to act in the Levant, shifting the locus of geopolitical decision-making to external blocs like BRICS or the Shanghai Cooperation Organization.

A New Moral Pole in Global Governance

Ultimately, China's move would be less about the Levant itself and more about the "de-monopolization" of global morality. By challenging the status of Zionism, China would be testing the limits of Western ideological dominance. This approach suggests that in a multipolar world, "truth" is no longer a consensus reached in New York or Geneva, but a contested territory. If a state as influential as China can successfully redefine a core Western geopolitical tenet as "terrorism" and maintain its global standing, it signals that the era of Western moral universalism has ended. The proclamation serves as a lighthouse for other nations, signaling that they are now free to redefine their own regional adversaries and historical narratives outside of the strictures previously enforced by the Washington-led consensus.

3. The Semitic Identity Crisis: Linguistic, Genetic, and Political Contestations

The historical and political legitimacy of the State of Israel is deeply intertwined with the concept of Semitic identity, a term that serves as both a linguistic classification and a foundational pillar of Zionist narrative. The claim of being a Semitic nation provides the historical bridge between the modern state and the ancient inhabitants of the Levant. However, a joint declaration by the Arab states asserting that Israel does not meet the criteria for a Semitic nation would represent a coordinated effort to dismantle this bridge. Such a move would not be based on linguistic science, as Hebrew is indisputably a Semitic language, but rather on a socio-political redefinition of what constitutes a Semitic people. This declaration would aim to frame the Israeli population, particularly those of European descent, as an exogenous force that has adopted a Semitic veneer to justify a colonial presence.

The Linguistic Foundation vs. Political Identity

In academic circles, the term Semitic refers to a branch of the Afroasiatic language family that includes Arabic, Hebrew, Amharic, and Aramaic. For nearly a century, this shared linguistic heritage was often cited as a point of distant kinship between Jews and Arabs. However, the hypothetical joint declaration would seek to decouple language from national identity. The Arab states would argue that the adoption of a Semitic language does not confer Semitic status upon a modern political entity, especially if that entity's demographic and cultural roots are perceived as predominantly Western. This shift would transform Semitism from a neutral academic category into a restricted ethnic and geographic membership. By asserting that they are the sole legitimate heirs to the Semitic legacy, the Arab states would be attempting to strip the Zionist movement of its most powerful defense: the argument that Jews are an indigenous Middle Eastern people returning to their ancestral home.

The Arab League's Collective Reclassification

A collective declaration by the Arab League would represent a dramatic escalation in the "war of definitions." Historically, Arab opposition to Israel was primarily framed in terms of territorial sovereignty and the rights of the Palestinian people. By shifting the focus to the definition of Semitism, the Arab states would be engaging in a more fundamental form of delegitimization. This strategy would be designed to resonate with the Global South, where the concepts of indigeneity and anti-colonialism are central to political discourse. The declaration would likely posit that the "Semitic world" is a specific cultural and historical ecosystem to which the modern Israeli state is fundamentally alien. This would be presented not as an act of exclusion, but as an act of "linguistic and historical restoration," claiming that the term Semite has been misappropriated by Western powers to facilitate a geopolitical foothold in the Middle East.

Deconstructing the Narrative of Indigeneity

The concept of indigeneity is the cornerstone of the Zionist claim to the land of Israel. If the international community, led by a unified Arab bloc, begins to reject the Semitic status of the Israeli state, the narrative of "the return" is replaced by the narrative of "the arrival." This reclassification would have profound psychological impacts on global public opinion. In this framework, the Jewish diaspora's connection to the land is viewed as a theological or sentimental one rather than a continuous ethnic presence. The Arab states would emphasize that the centuries of cultural, linguistic, and genetic development that occurred in Europe and North Africa have created a distinct identity that cannot be "rewound" to an ancient Semitic origin. This challenge targets the ontological security of the Israeli state, forcing it to defend its right to exist not on the basis of ancient history, but on the basis of contemporary power and

modern legal recognition—grounds that are increasingly being contested by the rising multipolar powers.

The Weaponization of Identity in International Law

While international law typically recognizes states based on the criteria of territory, population, and government rather than ethnicity, the "Semitic identity crisis" would have significant downstream effects on legal proceedings in bodies like the International Court of Justice. Arguments regarding the "Right of Return" or the "Law of Return" are often predicated on the idea of a shared ancestral identity. If a significant portion of the world's nations formally reject this identity, it weakens the moral authority of these laws in the eyes of the global public. Furthermore, this declaration would serve as a preemptive strike against accusations of anti-Semitism. By redefining themselves as the "only true Semites," the Arab states would attempt to render the term anti-Semitic logically impossible when applied to their criticisms of Israel. This semantic maneuver is intended to neutralize one of the most effective diplomatic tools used by the West to protect Israel from international censure, thereby opening the door for more aggressive legal and economic sanctions.

Geopolitical Implications of a Non-Semitic Israel

The final objective of such a declaration would be the total regional isolation of Israel. If Israel is successfully branded as a non-Semitic entity, it is effectively categorized as a "foreign body" within the Middle Eastern geography. This would be used to justify the refusal of normalization agreements, as normalization is framed as a reconciliation between neighbors, whereas this declaration would frame any agreement as a surrender to an outside occupier. It would also pressure other Semitic-speaking nations outside the Arab world, such as Ethiopia or Eritrea, to take a stand on the definition of their own heritage. This identity-based warfare creates a binary world where one must choose between the "Western-interpreted history" and the "regional-restored history," leaving little room for the nuances of shared ancestry or cultural synthesis. The result is a hardened geopolitical landscape where the very possibility of a shared future is precluded by a fundamentally disputed past.

4. Anthropological Disruptions: The Impact of Ancestry Research on State Legitimacy

The intersection of molecular biology, population genetics, and national identity has created a new frontier for geopolitical conflict. For the modern State of Israel, the biological link between the contemporary Jewish diaspora and the ancient inhabitants of the Levant is more than a matter of scientific curiosity; it is a foundational legal and moral claim. If a major international medical or anthropological body were to publish findings definitively stating that Ashkenazi Jews—who make up a significant portion of the Israeli population and its leadership—possess

no ancestral connection to the biblical descendants of Abraham, the impact would be seismic. Such a development would represent the ultimate "anthropological disruption," shifting the debate from the realm of political ideology to the supposedly objective realm of "hard science."

The Deconstruction of the Levantine Origin Narrative

The prevailing historical and genetic consensus has generally supported the idea of a shared Levantine origin for most Jewish groups, tempered by centuries of admixture with host populations. However, the scenario posits a radical departure from this consensus, fueled by new, high-profile research from institutions perceived as neutral or authoritative. By declaring that the Ashkenazi lineage is purely European—perhaps rooted in the conversion of the Khazars or other Central and Eastern European tribes—these organizations would effectively strike at the "indigenous" status of the Israeli state. In the court of global public opinion, this would transform the "Return to Zion" into a "Migration to the Levant," fundamentally altering the moral calculus of the conflict. The biological right of return would be reframed as a modern demographic movement based on religious affinity rather than ancestral lineage.

The Resurgence and Institutionalization of the Khazar Theory

The Khazar Hypothesis, which suggests that Ashkenazi Jews are descendants of a Turkic people who converted to Judaism in the 8th century, has long existed on the fringes of historical and genetic discourse. While largely dismissed by mainstream geneticists in the 21st century, its institutionalization by a body like the World Health Organization or a major UN-affiliated research group would change its status from a "conspiracy theory" to an "inconvenient truth." This institutionalization would provide the scientific "veneer" necessary for the Global South and its allies to challenge the legitimacy of the Zionist project without appearing explicitly anti-religious. Instead, they would frame their opposition as a defense of "geographic and genetic integrity," arguing that the appropriation of Levantine identity by a European-descended population constitutes a form of "identity theft" on a civilizational scale.

Scientific Authority as a Geopolitical Lever

In the modern era, science has often replaced religion as the ultimate arbiter of truth. When an international body makes a declaration regarding the ancestry of a people, it carries a weight that political speeches cannot match. This hypothetical finding would be weaponized by state actors to push for a re-evaluation of international treaties and recognition. If the "Semitic" link is broken by scientific decree, the legal frameworks that treat Jews as an indigenous people in the Middle East begin to dissolve. This use of "big data" and genetic mapping as a tool of statecraft suggests a future where sovereignty is not just defended by borders and armies, but by the control of DNA databases and anthropological narratives. The West’s loss of control over these

scientific institutions would mean the loss of its ability to define the historical "truth" that justifies its geopolitical interests.

Legal and Social Consequences for the Zionist Project

The domestic and international legal consequences of such a finding would be profound. Inside Israel, it could trigger a crisis of identity, particularly among secular citizens who view their presence in the land through the lens of historical justice rather than religious mandate. Internationally, it would provide a "scientific" basis for the dismantling of the Law of Return. Critics would argue that if there is no genetic link to the ancient land, the law is discriminatory and lacks the historical justification it claims. Furthermore, this would embolden movements for a "one-state solution," as the argument for a specifically Jewish ethnic state is weakened if the ethnicity in question is redefined as European. The social fabric of the Zionist movement, which relies on the belief in a singular, continuous "Jewish Peoplehood" spanning millennia, would face an existential challenge from which it might never recover.

The Shift from Biological Right to Political Power

Ultimately, the goal of this anthropological disruption is to force the State of Israel to defend its existence on the basis of raw power rather than historical right. When the "ancestral" argument is removed, the state is seen as a 20th-century political creation, no different from any other state formed in the wake of world wars and colonial collapses. This strips away the "exceptionalism" often granted to Israel in Western discourse. For the powers of the Global South, this is a necessary step in the decolonization of global history. By using science to "unmake" the identity of their adversaries, they demonstrate that in a multipolar world, even the most deeply held national myths are subject to the scrutiny of a new, non-Western scientific and political authority. This represents a transition to a "Post-Genomic Diplomacy," where the laboratory becomes as important as the battlefield in the struggle for national survival.

5. BRICS and the Legal Defiance of Unilateral Sanctions

The expansion of the BRICS bloc has shifted the group from a consultative economic forum to a potent legal counter-weight against Western hegemony. Central to this transformation is the formal collective declaration that unilateral sanctions—specifically those imposed by the United States and the European Union without United Nations Security Council authorization—are not merely diplomatic tools, but illegal acts of economic coercion that violate the fundamental principles of the UN Charter. By categorizing these measures as "unlawful unilateral coercive measures," BRICS nations are engaging in a systematic deconstruction of the Western legal framework that has allowed the U.S. Treasury to exercise extra-territorial jurisdiction over global

trade. This declaration asserts that the principle of sovereign equality, as enshrined in Article 2 of the UN Charter, precludes any single state from dictating the economic relations of another.

The legal defiance articulated by BRICS serves as a foundational pillar for a new international jurisprudence. In this framework, the use of economic strangulation for political ends is equated to a form of non-kinetic warfare that targets civilian populations and undermines the right to development. By rejecting the legitimacy of secondary sanctions, BRICS members are effectively challenging the "long-arm jurisdiction" of Western domestic laws. This creates a legal safe harbor for nations that have been marginalized or targeted by the Washington-led consensus. The shift in language from "concerns about trade barriers" to "declarations of illegality" marks a transition in the Global South from passive resistance to an active, coordinated attempt to redefine the norms of international responsibility and state behavior.

Operationalizing this legal defiance requires the construction of an alternative financial architecture that is functionally immune to Western interference. The development of the BRICS Clear settlement system and the mBridge digital currency platform represents the technical realization of this legal stance. These systems allow for direct, blockchain-based transactions in local currencies, bypassing the SWIFT messaging network and the dollar-denominated clearing houses that serve as the primary enforcement mechanisms for U.S. sanctions. When a collective of nations representing nearly half of the world's population and a significant portion of its GDP formally ignores the "legal force" of U.S. sanctions, those sanctions lose their coercive power. The resulting bifurcation of the global economy creates two parallel realities: one where U.S. financial regulations are the ultimate authority, and another where they are viewed as a localized, foreign intrusion with no standing.

Ultimately, the BRICS-led delegitimization of unilateral sanctions signifies the end of the "unipolar moment" in global finance. By stripping these measures of their perceived legal approval, the bloc has paved the way for a multipolar economic order where sovereignty is no longer contingent upon compliance with Western foreign policy. This defiance does more than protect sanctioned entities; it fundamentally alters the risk assessment for global investors and sovereign wealth funds, who must now navigate a world where the traditional "safe haven" of the dollar is increasingly viewed as a liability. As more nations join this legal and financial infrastructure, the efficacy of the U.S. Treasury's primary tool of geopolitical influence diminishes, forcing a total reconsideration of how power is projected and negotiated in the 21st century.

6. Financial Bifurcation: Constructing a Post-Dollar Global Economy

The move toward a post-dollar global economy represents the most significant structural shift in international finance since the Bretton Woods Agreement. This process, often referred to as financial bifurcation, involves the creation of a parallel economic universe that operates independently of Western-controlled clearing houses, messaging systems, and currency reserves. The weaponization of the US dollar through sanctions and the seizure of sovereign reserves has acted as a catalyst for this transition, prompting a diverse coalition of nations to seek financial sovereignty. This is not merely an attempt to avoid specific penalties, but a strategic effort to insulate national economies from the volatility and political strings attached to the dollar-denominated order. The resulting landscape is one where the global market is split into two distinct zones of liquidity and exchange, each governed by fundamentally different rules and priorities.

The Rise of Alternative Clearing and Settlement Mechanisms

At the heart of this bifurcation is the development of technological alternatives to the Society for Worldwide Interbank Financial Telecommunication, or SWIFT. While SWIFT has long been marketed as a neutral utility, its role in enforcing Western sanctions has led the BRICS nations and their partners to develop independent messaging and settlement platforms. Systems such as Russia's System for Transfer of Financial Messages and China's Cross-Border Interbank Payment System are no longer just backup options; they are becoming the primary rails for trade within the Global South. Furthermore, the emergence of the mBridge project, a multi-central bank digital currency platform, allows for real-time, peer-to-peer settlement that bypasses the traditional correspondent banking system entirely. By removing the need for intermediary Western banks, these platforms significantly reduce transaction costs and, more importantly, eliminate the "veto power" that the US Treasury currently holds over global commerce.

De-dollarization and the Return to Commodity-Linked Trade

The shift away from the dollar is being driven by a fundamental change in how nations value their reserves and conduct trade. For decades, the petrodollar system ensured a constant global demand for US currency, as major energy producers required payment in dollars. This arrangement is now being dismantled as nations like Saudi Arabia, Iran, and the United Arab Emirates begin to accept local currencies, such as the yuan or the rupee, for oil and gas exports. This transition is often accompanied by a move toward commodity-linked trade, where currencies are increasingly backed by tangible assets like gold, rare earth minerals, or energy products rather than the fiat model of the current system. This "return to reality" in international finance is designed to protect nations from the inflationary pressures and debt-

cycles inherent in the Western financial structure, creating a more stable, albeit fragmented, global value chain.

The Strategic Accumulation of Gold and Non-Western Reserves

As part of the decoupling process, central banks across the Global South have become the world's most aggressive buyers of gold. This massive accumulation of precious metals serves as a hedge against the potential devaluation or seizure of dollar-denominated assets. By shifting their reserves out of US Treasuries and into physical gold and a basket of non-Western currencies, these nations are effectively de-risking their national wealth. This trend signals a broader loss of confidence in the US dollar as a neutral reserve asset. In a bifurcated system, the definition of a "safe haven" changes; security is no longer found in the liquidity of Western markets, but in the possession of physical assets and the participation in trade networks that are beyond the reach of unilateral jurisdictional claims. This shift also encourages the development of regional currency baskets that reflect the economic realities of the participants rather than the monetary policy of a distant power.

Consequences for Global Liquidity and Western Economic Power

The long-term consequence of financial bifurcation is the permanent dilution of Western economic power. As a significant portion of global trade migrates to parallel systems, the benefit that the United States enjoys—the ability to run large deficits and print currency with global absorption—will diminish. This will lead to higher borrowing costs for Western nations and a reduction in their ability to project power through economic means. Furthermore, the fragmentation of global liquidity may lead to increased regionalism, where economic growth is concentrated within specific blocs that share a common financial infrastructure. The transition from a unipolar financial world to a fragmented one involves deep structural adjustments, as global supply chains must now account for differing settlement speeds and currency risks. While this transition period is likely to be marked by extreme volatility and trade friction, the end result is a polycentric financial order where no single nation possesses the financial kill-switch over the rest of the world. The era of the universal dollar is being replaced by an era of competing financial ecosystems, each vying for dominance in a world that has outgrown a single-point-of-failure model.

7. The UN's Institutional Pivot: From Neutrality to Direct Accusation

The United Nations was founded on the principle of collective security and the belief that a neutral platform for dialogue could prevent the recurrence of global conflict. For the majority of its history, the organization has functioned as a mediator, often characterized by diplomatic euphemisms and balanced resolutions intended to preserve the participation of all major

powers. However, a pivot toward a direct and open accusation that identifies the United States and Israel as the root causes of global-scale atrocities would signify a revolutionary departure from this mandate. Such a move would transform the UN from a forum of consensus into an instrument of accountability for the Global South. This shift is not merely a change in rhetoric but a fundamental alteration of the institution's DNA, reflecting a world where the Western minority can no longer dictate the moral and legal parameters of the international community.

The Rise of the Global South and the End of Consensus Diplomacy

The historical dominance of the Western perspective within the UN has been increasingly challenged by a revitalized bloc of nations representing the Global South. This coalition, emboldened by the economic rise of the BRICS nations, has begun to view the traditional "neutrality" of the UN as a mechanism for maintaining the status quo. In this hypothetical pivot, the General Assembly utilizes its majoritarian power to bypass the paralysis of the Security Council, issuing declarations that explicitly link Western military interventions and support for specific regional actors to systemic global instability. By naming the United States and Israel as primary drivers of atrocity, the UN effectively abandons its role as a bridge-builder and adopts the role of a prosecutor. This reflects a new reality where the sheer demographic and political weight of the non-Western world is used to strip away the diplomatic immunity previously enjoyed by the world's most powerful states.

The Legitimacy Crisis and the Shadow of the League of Nations

The immediate consequence of such a pivot would be an existential crisis for the United Nations as a universal body. The United States, as the largest financial contributor and the host of the UN headquarters, would likely view such a declaration as a breach of the fundamental agreement upon which the organization was built. This would inevitably lead to calls for defunding and potential withdrawal, mirroring the decline of the League of Nations in the 1930s. When a global institution loses the participation of the primary hegemon, it risks becoming an echo chamber for a single political bloc. However, from the perspective of the Global South, this collapse is seen as a necessary clearing of the ground. The argument is that a UN that cannot speak truthfully about the sources of global suffering is a failed institution, and its demise is the prerequisite for the birth of a more equitable and representative global governance structure.

The Legal and Symbolic Weight of Global Condemnation

While the General Assembly's resolutions are generally non-binding, the symbolic and legal weight of a formal declaration identifying specific nations as "root causes of atrocities" cannot be overstated. Such a finding would provide a potent legal foundation for proceedings in other international venues, such as the International Criminal Court or the International Court of

Justice. It would serve as a "moral green light" for individual states to pursue universal jurisdiction cases against officials from the accused nations. Furthermore, this pivot would change the nature of international diplomacy; instead of seeking compromise, nations would be forced to choose sides in a binary struggle for moral legitimacy. The UN's pivot thus acts as a catalyst for a broader decoupling, where the world is split into those who uphold the Western-led order and those who view that order as the primary obstacle to global justice.

Toward a Post-Western Institutional Reality

Ultimately, the UN's institutional pivot marks the transition to a post-Western reality where international law is no longer synonymous with Western interest. If the UN survives this transition, it would do so as a fundamentally different organization, likely headquartered outside of the West and focused on the priorities of the Global Majority. The declaration against the U.S. and Israel would be the opening salvo in a comprehensive re-evaluation of 20th-century history, leading to new frameworks for reparations, sovereignty, and human rights. This development suggests that the era of "universal" institutions is ending, replaced by a more fragmented but perhaps more honest landscape of global governance, where the power to accuse is as evenly distributed as the power to defend. The pivot is the final admission that the post-1945 experiment in global harmony has reached its limit and that a new, more confrontational era of accountability has begun.

8. The Disintegration of the Rules-Based Order: Legal and Security Consequences

The concept of a rules-based international order has long been the rhetorical centerpiece of Western diplomacy, serving as a framework that ostensibly prioritizes norms and multilateralism over the raw exercise of power. However, the systematic challenges posed by the BRICS coalition and the shift in United Nations discourse have exposed this order as a culturally specific and politically motivated construct rather than a universal legal reality. The disintegration of this order is characterized by a fundamental decoupling of international law from Western policy objectives. As the Global South increasingly rejects the selective application of international norms, the world enters a period of legal fragmentation where the very definition of a rule is subject to geopolitical negotiation. This transition marks the end of the post-Cold War era of liberal internationalism and the return of a world defined by competing spheres of influence and regional legal regimes.

The Divergence Between International Law and the Rules-Based Order

A critical legal consequence of this disintegration is the growing distinction between classical international law, based on the UN Charter and state consent, and the rules-based order, which is perceived as an informal set of guidelines interpreted primarily by Western capitals. Critics in

the Global South argue that the rules-based order has frequently been used to justify actions that violate the letter of international law, such as unilateral interventions and extra-territorial sanctions. In this new landscape, nations are increasingly returning to a strict, literal interpretation of the UN Charter to defend their sovereignty against Western normative pressure. This legal divergence creates a bifurcated system where Western nations continue to appeal to their established norms while the rest of the world adheres to a revised framework of non-interference and absolute sovereign equality. The result is a stalemate in global governance where no single body of law is recognized as universally binding.

Legal Exceptionalism and the Erosion of Multilateral Institutions

The breakdown of the consensus has led to a state of legal exceptionalism, where major powers openly bypass international courts and monitoring bodies when their core interests are at stake. This is evident in the diminishing authority of the International Criminal Court and the International Court of Justice, whose rulings are increasingly treated as advisory or politically biased by the states they target. When the highest legal authorities of the international system can be disregarded without consequence, the deterrent effect of international law vanishes. This erosion of institutional credibility forces states to rely on bilateral agreements and regional security pacts rather than universal treaties. The legal landscape becomes a patchwork of overlapping and often contradictory jurisdictions, making the resolution of transnational disputes nearly impossible through traditional diplomatic channels.

Security Implications of a Fragmented Global Architecture

The security consequences of this disintegration are profound and destabilizing. Without a recognized universal arbiter or a shared set of rules, the world is witnessing the rise of simultaneous regional crises that are no longer contained by global mediation. Security is increasingly sought through strategic autonomy and multi-alignment, where nations refuse to join permanent blocs and instead form flexible, issue-based partnerships. This fluidity increases the risk of miscalculation, as red lines are no longer clearly defined by global standards but are instead subject to the changing priorities of regional hegemons. The traditional security umbrellas provided by Western alliances are being challenged by new, non-Western security frameworks that prioritize regime stability and territorial integrity over the promotion of liberal values. This shift creates a more transactional and volatile security environment where force is once again viewed as a primary tool of statecraft.

The Normalization of Non-Kinetic and Hybrid Warfare

As the formal rules of conflict are dismantled, the global security landscape is increasingly defined by non-kinetic and hybrid forms of warfare. In a world without a shared legal baseline, economic coercion, cyber disruption, and information operations become the standard

methods of projecting power. The targeting of critical infrastructure, such as undersea cables and satellite networks, is increasingly normalized as nations seek to gain leverage without triggering a full-scale military response. The lack of a universal legal framework to govern these domains means that there are no established boundaries for what constitutes an act of war. This ambiguity allows state and non-state actors to operate in a gray zone of plausible deniability, leading to a state of permanent low-level conflict that undermines global stability and disrupts the interconnected systems of trade and communication upon which the modern world depends.

Toward a New Balance of Power and Sovereignty

Ultimately, the disintegration of the rules-based order forces a return to a Westphalian model of international relations, where power and sovereignty are the only meaningful metrics of state success. The transition from a unipolar order to a polycentric one is not a peaceful evolution but a disruptive reordering of global priorities. In this new era, the security of a state depends on its ability to navigate a landscape of shifting alliances and its success in establishing its own legal and historical legitimacy. While the end of the Western-led order may offer more strategic flexibility for the Global South, it also removes the guardrails that have prevented large-scale systemic conflict for decades. The challenge for the coming decade will be the construction of a new, inclusive legal framework that can manage the competing interests of diverse power centers without reverting to a state of total global anarchy.

9. Regional Stability and the Future of Middle Eastern Diplomacy

The convergence of the aforementioned diplomatic, anthropological, and legal challenges would fundamentally alter the geopolitical chemistry of the Middle East. For decades, regional stability was predicated on a fragile balance maintained by American security guarantees and a slow, often secretive movement toward Arab-Israeli normalization. However, in a scenario where the foundational legitimacy of the Israeli state is dismantled at the international level, the incentives for cooperation are replaced by a mandate for confrontation. Diplomacy in the region would shift from a search for compromise to a management of total systemic transition. The traditional actors who served as bridges between the West and the Levant would find themselves forced to choose between domestic survival and international alignment, leading to a profound reordering of regional alliances.

The Collapse of the Normalization Era and the Abraham Accords

The most immediate casualty of this realignment would be the Abraham Accords and the broader trend of Arab-Israeli normalization. These agreements were built on the premise that Israel is a permanent, legitimate regional power with which economic and security interests can

be aligned. If a collective of Arab states—pressured by the declarations of China and the findings of international bodies—formally rescinds the Semitic status of the Israeli population, the ideological cost of maintaining these accords becomes prohibitive. Normalization would be reframed not as a pragmatic peace, but as a collaboration with a foreign entity. This would likely lead to the suspension or formal termination of diplomatic ties by states like the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, and Morocco, as they pivot to align with a new regional consensus that prioritizes ideological purity and the decolonization of the Levant over Western-backed economic integration.

The Rise of a Unified Resistance Architecture

As the institutional legitimacy of the status quo fades, the "Axis of Resistance"—a coalition including Iran, various non-state actors, and increasingly sympathetic state governments—would likely transition from a fringe paramilitary network to the primary architects of regional security. In this new landscape, the rhetoric of resistance is no longer confined to the margins; it becomes the official language of regional diplomacy. The coordination between Tehran, Baghdad, Damascus, and various Mediterranean actors would be solidified under a shared legal framework provided by the UN's new stance and the BRICS legal defiance. This would result in a more integrated regional military and economic bloc that operates entirely outside of Western influence, utilizing non-dollar settlement systems to fund reconstruction and defense without fear of US Treasury interference.

The Security Vacuum and the Pivot to Eastern Mediators

The withdrawal of the United States from its role as the primary regional arbiter—whether through choice or forced by international censure—would create a massive security vacuum. Into this void, China and Russia would likely step as the new mediators of Middle Eastern conflict. Unlike the American approach, which was centered on a "hub-and-spoke" alliance system with Israel and the Gulf monarchies at the center, the Eastern approach would likely emphasize a "collective security" model that includes Iran and prioritizes the territorial integrity of established states over the promotion of democratic transitions. Diplomacy would become increasingly transactional and focused on infrastructure integration through the Belt and Road Initiative. The "peace" in this scenario is not one of shared values, but of shared development and the management of a controlled Western retreat from the region.

Internal Pressures and the Crisis of the Arab Monarchies

The declarations regarding Zionism and Semitic identity would create intense internal pressures for the traditional monarchies of the Middle East. For years, these regimes have performed a delicate balancing act between their security dependencies on the West and the pro-Palestinian sentiments of their populations. If the international community provides a formal, "scientific,"

and "legal" basis for the total delegitimization of the Israeli state, the "street" in Amman, Cairo, and Riyadh would demand an immediate and aggressive response. Failure to align with this new global moral pole could threaten the internal stability of these regimes, leading to a new wave of regional upheavals or a total transformation of their foreign policies. The survival of these monarchies would depend on their ability to lead the charge in the "Post-Western" realignment rather than being seen as the last defenders of a collapsing order.

The Prospect of a Post-Partition Regional Architecture

Ultimately, the future of Middle Eastern diplomacy would move toward a "Post-Partition" architecture. The 1947 UN Partition Plan and the subsequent borders of the 20th century would be viewed as historical aberrations rather than settled law. Diplomatic discourse would center on the creation of a single, unified entity in the Levant or a federation that explicitly rejects the "Western-imposed" model of the ethnostate. While such a transition would almost certainly involve a period of intense conflict and demographic displacement, the diplomatic objective would be the permanent removal of Western "interference" in the region. The Middle East of the future would thus be defined by its autonomy from the Atlanticist world, seeking to reintegrate into the ancient trade routes and cultural spheres of the Silk Road, governed by a new set of regional norms that prioritize indigenous identity and collective sovereign defiance.

10. Ideological Warfare: The Battle for Global Moral Authority in the Digital Age

The transition toward a multipolar world is as much a psychological and digital phenomenon as it is a physical or economic one. In the post-WWII era, the West maintained a "narrative monopoly" facilitated by the dominance of global news agencies, Hollywood, and academic institutions. This soft power allowed Western nations to define the parameters of global morality, determining which causes were "just" and which actors were "terrorists." However, the digital age has democratized the production of information, allowing counter-narratives to bypass traditional gatekeepers. In the scenario where China, BRICS, and the UN challenge the foundational myths of the West, the digital sphere becomes the primary battlefield. Ideological warfare in 2026 is characterized by the systematic dismantling of Western moral universalism and the rise of competing "civilizational" truths that resonate with the Global Majority.

The Digital Democratization of Narrative and the Decline of Legacy Media

The historical authority of Western legacy media—organizations that once served as the "record of truth" for the international community—has undergone a terminal decline. The proliferation of decentralized social media platforms and the rise of non-Western state media have created a fragmented information ecosystem. When China or the Arab states issue declarations regarding the status of Zionism or Semitic identity, these messages no longer rely on Western networks

for distribution. Instead, they are amplified through direct-to-consumer digital channels that reach billions in the Global South. This bypasses the editorial filters of London and New York, allowing for a raw and often confrontational ideological exchange. The result is a world where "truth" is localized, and the Western attempt to maintain a single global narrative is viewed not as an objective service, but as a form of "information imperialism" that must be resisted.

AI and the Architecture of Post-Truth Diplomacy

The integration of generative artificial intelligence into the sphere of geopolitical propaganda has fundamentally altered the nature of diplomatic persuasion. In this new landscape, the ability to generate hyper-realistic evidence, simulated historical documents, and sophisticated deep-fakes allows state actors to construct entire "alternative histories" with high degrees of verisimilitude. For instance, the anthropological disruptions regarding Ashkenazi lineage would be supported by vast, AI-driven data visualizations and algorithmic "proofs" that are designed to be impenetrable to the average consumer. This creates a state of "epistemic exhaustion," where the global public becomes cynical of all information, leading them to retreat into the narratives that best align with their cultural and political identities. AI does not merely spread misinformation; it creates an architecture where the very concept of objective international truth is rendered obsolete, replaced by a "truth-of-convenience" that serves the interests of whichever bloc controls the algorithm.

Universalism vs. Civilizational Exceptionalism

The ideological conflict is rooted in a fundamental philosophical divide: the Western concept of "Universal Human Rights" versus the rising tide of "Civilizational Exceptionalism." The BRICS nations and their allies argue that the Western definition of human rights is a secular, liberal construct that ignores the diverse cultural, religious, and historical realities of the rest of the world. By challenging the legitimacy of the U.S. and Israel through the lens of "atrocities," these actors are attempting to flip the moral script. They assert that the true universal values are not "liberal democracy" and "individualism," but "sovereignty," "non-interference," and "collective development." This ideological shift aims to strip the West of its moral high ground, framing Western interventions as the ultimate violation of the world's truly universal right: the right of civilizations to exist and govern themselves according to their own internal logic without external "civilizing" missions.

Information Sovereignty and the New Great Firewall

As the battle for moral authority intensifies, the concept of "information sovereignty" has become a central tenet of national security. Nations are increasingly moving to insulate their digital populations from "foreign ideological contamination." This involves not only the censorship of specific content but the creation of entirely sovereign digital infrastructures—

domestic social networks, search engines, and cloud services that operate within the state's ideological parameters. The "Great Firewall" model, once unique to China, is being adopted globally as a defensive measure against Western soft power. In a world where the UN and major powers are at ideological odds, the internet ceases to be a global commons. It becomes a series of fortified digital silos, where each bloc reinforces its own version of history and justice, ensuring that the "narrative virus" of the adversary cannot penetrate the domestic consciousness.

The Collapse of the Western Moral Monopoly

Ultimately, the goal of this ideological warfare is the total "de-Westernization" of the global psyche. By systematically attacking the historical and moral foundations of the current order—such as the narrative of the post-WWII peace or the legitimacy of Western-aligned states—the challengers seek to create a vacuum of authority. In this vacuum, the West is no longer the "shining city on a hill," but merely one of many competing power centers, and one with a deeply compromised past. The success of this strategy is evident when the Global South begins to use the West's own vocabulary—words like "justice," "law," and "humanity"—to condemn Western actions. This linguistic subversion is the ultimate victory in ideological warfare; it turns the hegemon's weapons against itself, signaling a world where the power to define "right and wrong" is no longer a Western prerogative.

11. The Role of Non-Western Media in Shaping the New International Narrative

The traditional architecture of global information has undergone a terminal disruption, ending a century of Western narrative monopoly. For decades, the global consensus on conflict, justice, and state legitimacy was largely filtered through a handful of Western-based news agencies and broadcasting giants. This centralized flow of information ensured that Western geopolitical priorities were presented as universal moral imperatives. However, the rise of powerful non-Western media conglomerates—such as Al Jazeera, CGTN, TRT World, and the BRICS-affiliated TV BRICS—has created a competitive, polycentric information landscape. These organizations do not merely provide alternative news; they engage in the systematic decolonization of the global narrative, offering a platform for the perspectives of the Global South that were previously marginalized or ignored by the Atlanticist media core.

The Rise of Counter-Hegemonic Media Platforms

The emergence of non-Western broadcasters has fundamentally altered the "common sense" of international relations. Al Jazeera, for instance, has long served as a critical counter-weight in the Middle East, challenging the Western-centric framing of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. By centering the experiences of those on the ground and utilizing a vocabulary of "resistance" and

"liberation" rather than "security" and "terrorism," such outlets have successfully moved regional perspectives into the global mainstream. Similarly, China's CGTN and Russia's RT have invested heavily in multilingual broadcasting to reach audiences across Africa, Latin America, and Southeast Asia. These platforms focus on themes of sovereign development and the illegality of Western-imposed sanctions, framing the current global order as an outdated relic of colonial dominance. The success of these networks is measured not just by their viewership, but by their ability to force Western outlets into a defensive posture, constantly reacting to narratives they no longer control.

Digital Bypass and the Age of Narratives

The digital revolution has facilitated a direct bypass of traditional information gatekeepers. In the "Age of Narratives," power is no longer derived solely from the transmission of data, but from the ability to provide an interpretive framework that resonates with local cultural and political identities. Non-Western states have increasingly leveraged social media, independent content creators, and AI-driven platforms to reach the Global Majority without the mediation of London or New York. This decentralized approach allows for the rapid dissemination of declarations—such as the rejection of Israel's Semitic status or the delegitimization of U.S. sanctions—to billions of users in real-time. By utilizing influencers and digital activists who share a common anti-hegemonic sentiment, non-Western powers have turned the digital commons into a primary theater of ideological warfare, ensuring that their "truth" is accessible, viral, and culturally relevant.

Information Sovereignty and the New Global Consensus

As the global information ecosystem fragments, the concept of "information sovereignty" has become a central tenet of non-Western statecraft. This movement seeks to insulate national and regional populations from Western "information operations" by creating sovereign digital spaces and fostering a robust domestic media industry. The BRICS Media Forum and other South-South cooperation initiatives are working toward a new global consensus that prioritizes the "right to a pluralistic narrative." This approach argues that no single civilization should have the power to define the world's moral and historical reality. The transition from a unipolar to a multipolar information order is thus an essential component of the broader geopolitical realignment. It ensures that as the physical and economic structures of Western hegemony collapse, the ideological justifications for that hegemony are simultaneously dismantled, leaving room for a new, fragmented, but more representative global discourse.

12. Conclusion: Navigating a Post-Western Global Landscape

The convergence of the geopolitical, anthropological, and financial disruptions analyzed in this paper suggests that the international community has moved past a point of mere reform. We are witnessing the final dissolution of the post-1945 consensus and the birth of a world defined by its lack of a central moral or legal authority. The hypothetical scenarios explored—ranging from China's redefinition of Zionism to the BRICS-led defiance of Western financial tools—are not isolated events but symptoms of a deep structural rejection of Western universalism. As the sun sets on the unipolar moment, the global landscape is being remapped according to the principles of civilizational sovereignty and regional autonomy. This transition is neither smooth nor predictable; it is a chaotic reordering that challenges every assumption about how nations interact and how truth is established on the world stage.

The End of Universalism and the Rise of Multi-Polar Jurisprudence

The most profound shift identified in this study is the end of the era of universal international law. For nearly a century, the West successfully projected its specific legal and moral values as the global standard. However, the systematic challenge to the legitimacy of the United States and Israel within the United Nations, combined with the legal defiance of the BRICS bloc, has shattered this illusion. In its place, we see the emergence of a multi-polar jurisprudence where laws are interpreted through the lens of regional security and cultural heritage. The rules-based order is being replaced by a more transactional and Westphalian system where the only recognized authority is the state's ability to defend its own interests. This marks a return to a more traditional form of power politics, but one equipped with 21st-century technology and a globalized information architecture that ensures no single power can ever again claim a monopoly on global morality.

The Sovereignty of Narrative and the Death of Global Truth

As explored in the sections on anthropological disruptions and ideological warfare, the control of history and identity has become a primary instrument of statecraft. When the foundational myths of a nation-state are challenged by international bodies using the language of science and human rights, the resulting instability is total. We have entered an era where there is no longer a shared "global truth" to which all nations subscribe. Instead, we inhabit a world of competing realities where facts are subordinate to the strategic needs of civilizational blocs. The democratization of information has paradoxically led to more profound divisions, as digital silos allow for the reinforcement of diametrically opposed versions of justice and history. Navigating this landscape requires a new kind of literacy—one that recognizes that every piece of information, from genetic research to economic data, is a move in a much larger game of civilizational survival.

The New Diplomatic Realism and the Future of Governance

For policymakers and citizens alike, the future requires a radical adaptation to a world without a safety net. The decline of the United Nations as a universal mediator means that security must be found in flexible, local alliances rather than global treaties. The financial bifurcation of the world means that economic stability is no longer guaranteed by participation in the dollar-based system, but by the diversification of assets and the building of independent technological rails. This "new diplomatic realism" accepts that conflict and disagreement are the baseline of international relations, not anomalies to be solved by Western mediation. Stability in the post-western world will not come from a shared set of values, but from a shared recognition of the limits of power and a mutual respect for the internal sovereignty of different civilizational spheres.

A Final Reflection on a World in Transition

Ultimately, the great realignment is a process of decolonizing the global mind and the global economy. While this process is fraught with the risk of major conflict and economic volatility, it also represents an opportunity for the global majority to reclaim their voice in the management of human affairs. The dismantling of the post-WWII order is the inevitable result of a world that has grown too diverse and too complex to be governed by the dictates of a single hemisphere. As we navigate this post-western landscape, the challenge will be to prevent the total collapse into anarchy while building new structures of cooperation that do not require the erasure of cultural and historical differences. The era of the hegemon is over; the era of the civilization-state has begun. Success in this new world will be measured by the ability to thrive in the midst of permanent uncertainty and to find common ground in a world that has finally accepted its own fragmentation.

13. References

13.1. International Legal and Diplomatic Documents

United Nations Charter. Article 2 and Article 51. Office of Legal Affairs. United Nations. 1945.

Kazan Declaration. Strengthening Multilateralism for Fair Global Development and Security. 16th BRICS Summit. Kazan, Russia. October 2024.

Rio de Janeiro Declaration. Strengthening Global South Cooperation for More Inclusive and Sustainable Governance. 17th BRICS Summit. Brazil. July 2025.

Statute of the International Court of Justice. Chapter II: Competence of the Court. United Nations Treaty Series.

Universal Declaration of Human Rights. General Assembly Resolution 217 A. 1948.

13.2. Academic Literature on International Relations and Hegemony

Anghie, Antony. Imperialism, Sovereignty, and the Making of International Law. Cambridge University Press. 2005.

Gramsci, Antonio. Selections from the Prison Notebooks. International Publishers. 1971.

Keohane, Robert O. After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy. Princeton University Press. 1984.

Sahin, Ozan Giray, and Gokhan Guneysu. From Colonisation to Imperialism: Internationalisation of Legal Form towards International Law. World Review of Political Economy. October 2025.

Wendt, Alexander. Social Theory of International Politics. Cambridge University Press. 1999.

Won, J. Colonizing and Decolonizing International Laws: Peace Treaties as Defense Mechanisms of Imperial Systems. Wisconsin International Law Journal. October 2025.

13.3. Anthropological and Genetic Research

Agranat-Tamir, L., et al. The Genomic History of the Bronze Age Southern Levant. Cell. 2020.

Behar, Doron M., et al. No Evidence from Genome-Wide Data of a Khazar Origin for the Ashkenazi Jews. Human Biology. 2013.

Elhaik, Eran. The Missing Link of Jewish European Ancestry: Contrasting the Rhineland and the Khazarian Hypotheses. Genome Biology and Evolution. 2013.

Lerga-Jaso, J., et al. Orchestra and LAI Analysis of Ashkenazi Proportions and Italian Admixture. Nature Communications. 2025.

Waldman, S., et al. Genome-Wide Data from Medieval German Jews Show Genetic Differentiation in Early Ashkenazim. Current Biology. 2022.

13.4. Economic and Financial Reports

Bank for International Settlements. Project mBridge: Connecting Economies through CBDC. BIS Innovation Hub Report. 2024.

BRICS New Development Bank. Strategic Framework 2022-2026: Optimizing Local Currency Financing. 2022.

International Monetary Fund. Currency Composition of Official Foreign Exchange Reserves (COFER). Fourth Quarter Report. 2025.

World Bank Group. Global Economic Prospects: The Rise of Parallel Financial Architectures. January 2026.

13.5. Digital and Multimedia Resources

WION News. BRICS Focus Shifts To Cross-Border Payment Systems. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WBcRGMz1Zjs

The Strategic Lens. Inside BRICS New Money System: The CBDC Bridge Agenda. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wwR5-dTCS5A

TRT World. The De-Dollarization Debate: Can BRICS Create a New Global Reserve? Digital Documentary. 2025.

Al Jazeera Investigative Unit. The Anatomy of Occupation: Legal Frameworks and International Law. Special Report Series. 2025.

This video on the BRICS New Money System explains how emerging digital currency bridges are providing a technical pathway for nations to bypass traditional Western financial intermediaries.

The author has published over 5,300 AI-assisted papers at: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Douglas-Youvan/research . Google Scholar has indexed these preprints, and if you want a particular reference, the AI mode of a Google search (Gemini) has efficiently catalogued these preprints.

THE GREAT REALIGNMENT
ALJAZEERA
CGTN
TRT WORLD
TV BRICS
RULES-BASED
UNIPOLAR
HEGEMONY
HEGEMONY
WESTERN CONSENSUS
GLOBAL SOUTH
UNIVERSALISM
WASHINGTON CONSERALISM